

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ENOVSYS LLC,

Plaintiff,

VS.

AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T MOBILITY II LLC,

Defendants.

AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T MOBILITY II LLC,

Counterclaimants,

VS.

ENOVSYS LLC,

Counterdefendant.

Case No.: 2:11-CV-05210-SS

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

Honorable Suzanne H. Segal

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

CASE NO. 2:11-cv-05210-SS

1 The above-entitled matter was tried to a jury before the Honorable Suzanne
2 H. Segal, United States Magistrate Judge presiding by consent of all parties. On
3 August 27, 2015, after deliberation, the jury returned a special verdict addressing
4 infringement, anticipation, statutory bars, and obviousness and found that plaintiff,
5 Enovsys LLC (“Enovsys”), had not proved that defendants AT&T Mobility LLC
6 and AT&T Mobility II LLC (collectively, “AT&T”) infringed claims 1, 11, 13, or
7 28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,461 (“‘461 patent”); that Enovsys had not proved that
8 AT&T infringed claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,925,273 (“‘273 patent”); that AT&T
9 had proved that claims 1, 11, and 13 of the ‘461 patent were anticipated; that
10 AT&T had not proved that claim 28 of the ‘461 patent was anticipated; that AT&T
11 had proved that claims 1, 11, and 13 of the ‘461 patent were not filed within the
12 time required by law; that AT&T had not proved that claim 28 of the ‘461 patent
13 was not filed within the time required by law; that AT&T had proved that claims
14 1, 11, and 13 of the ‘461 patent were obvious; and that AT&T had not proved that
15 claim 28 of the ‘461 patent was obvious.

16 Accordingly, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54 and 58, IT IS
17 HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that judgment is entered in
18 favor of AT&T as follows:

19

- 20 1. AT&T has not infringed U.S. Patent No. 6,560,461.
- 21 2. Claims 1, 11, and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,461 are invalid.
- 22 3. Claim 28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,461 is not invalid.
- 23 4. AT&T’s counterclaims of invalidity as to the remaining claims of
24 U.S. Patent No. 6,560,461 are dismissed without prejudice.
- 25 5. AT&T has not infringed U.S. Patent No. 7,925,273.
- 26 6. Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,925,273 is not invalid.
- 27 7. Plaintiff Enovsys shall recover nothing on its claims.


28

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that AT&T is the
2 prevailing party entitled to recover costs pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
3 Procedure 54(d) and Local Rule 54-1.

4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6
7 DATED: Nov. 16, 2015


8 Honorable Suzanne H. Segal
9 United States Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28